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1.1 Background of the competition

“Helsinki Zoo is active in conservation and delivers a high-quality guest experience.”

The Helsinki Zoo focuses on conservation of endangered species and operates the whole spectrum of conservation activities from breeding of threatened species, research, public education and training to in situ support of species, populations and their habitats. The zoo participates in global conservation programs. Today’s major task in Helsinki Zoo is to describe their mission to visitors, associate their zoo internal activities with external conservation programs and to create a strong engagement to environmental and conservation issues.

The City of Helsinki hold a closed landscape architectural ideas competition for the planning of the Helsinki Zoo in Korkeasaari and recreational areas surrounding the zoo. Revitalizing the area has become a relevant issue due to new land-use in the neighbouring harbour areas and consequently a rising number of potential visitors to the island. The zoo can attract a large number of people and provide them with education, information and well designed environment.

The competition area includes three islands: Korkeasaari, Hylkysaari and Palosaari. The existing zoo is located on Korkeasaari, occupying the entire island. Hylkysaari (3.2 ha) is located on the southern side of Korkeasaari and it has been occupied by the National Marine Museum until recently. Palosaari is located east of Korkeasaari and it is currently used for the zoo’s quarantine facilities.

The first priority in the competition was to find a feasible concept for the zoo renewal suitable for the landscape and conditions on Korkeasaari island. Ideas and principles are needed for more detailed planning of the zoo. A master plan for the whole competition area will be prepared by municipal authorities on the basis of the competition results and ideas presented in competition proposals. Detailed plans will be prepared area by area according to the schedule determined later in the process.

Further planning process and finally implementing the plans is estimated to take at least ten years beginning in 2009. Changing the city’s structure is an on going process, as is the renewal of the zoo.

1.2 Organiser, nature and purpose of the competition

The City of Helsinki, owner of Helsinki Zoo, is in the process of initiating a new Master Plan for the zoo. A landscape architectural ideas competition has been arranged during 2008, serving as a framework for the Master Plan. A previous Master Plan of the zoo was from 1994, but the need for a more comprehensive examination has become obvious. The objective of the competition was to renew the existing zoo and to provide new ideas for the recreational use of the entire competition area.

The purpose of the competition was to explore the possibilities to develop the area as a more attractive and appealing recreational area. The competition was aiming at clarifying the guidelines for a master plan that is in keeping with the area and meets the planning objectives, and, based on this plan, high quality and feasible starting points for making the detailed plan for the zoo, waterfronts and recreational use. Helsinki Zoo being one of only few zoos on an island, its new image should take full advantage of its maritime surroundings and elements provided by its natural landscape.

In the new Master Plan the zoo is to be seen as an ecological and educational centre, attractive and inspirational to the visitor, maintaining rare and endangered species and providing state-of-the-art information concerning the decline of biodiversity and the effects of climate change and other human impacts on nature and wildlife. Much emphasis is given to enclosures promoting natural behaviour and breeding.

The park will provide aesthetic experience, various leisure time and recreational opportunities as well as smooth and safe routes for pedestrians, despite the challenging topography. All age and interest groups are equally taken into consideration in planning the zoo and services. Although traditionally the customers of the zoo have been families with young children, in future the zoo on Korkeasaari could be interesting and alluring to all age groups. The zoo needs new facilities and service to supply different customers.
1.3 Participants
Beckmann-N’Thepe
Paris, France
Maisemasunnittelu Hemgård
Helsinki, Finland
SLA
Copenhagen, Denmark

1.4 Compensation
Each participating architectural office that submit a proposal which met the requirements of the competition brief was paid EUR 50 000 (VAT 0%).

1.5 Jury
The competition entries were evaluated by a jury whose members were:
Tuula Haatainen
Deputy Mayor, Chair
Tuomas Rajajärvi
Architect, Director of City Planning Department
Seppo Turunen
Director of the Helsinki Zoo
Sakari Mentu
Architect, The National Board of Antiquities

Ria Ruokonen
Landscape architect, appointed by the Finnish Association of Landscape Architects MARK
Kirsi Pynnönen-Oudman
Helsinki Zoo, Secretary
Tuomas Hakala
Architect, City Planning Department, Secretary

1.6 Working committee
Seppo Turunen, Ria Ruokonen, Kaisa Rodriguez, Kirsi Pynnönen and Tuomas Hakala formed the working committee of the jury.

1.7 Experts
The following persons served as experts to the jury:
• Monika Fiby, Diplomingenieur, Master of Landscape Architecture
• Kaisa Rodriguez, Landscape Architect, Helsinki City Planning Department
• Leif Blomqvist, Helsinki Zoo
• Taru Vuori, Helsinki Zoo

1.8 Competition process

1.8.1 Competition rules and approval of the competition brief
The competition followed the rules, which are accepted in December 2007 by the SAFA’s Delegates Council. The jury, the competition secretary and the representative of the Finnish Association of Landscape Architects approved the competition brief as adhering to the competition rules of the Finnish Association of Architects.

1.9 Competition schedule and questions
The competition was commenced at the opening seminar on the 13th of June, 2008, in Helsinki where the competition brief and the necessary background information were presented to participants. In the seminar, landscape architect Monika Fiby served as moderator. In conjunction with the seminar, the participants were also given the opportunity to visit the competition area.

The competition closed on 31st of October 2008.
2.1 Location of the design area

The geographical location of Korkeasaari mediates the Vanhakaupunki bay in the north and the seascape of the Kruunuvuorenselkä bay in the south. The competition area is located on the east side of the Helsinki downtown area. The design area consists of three islands connected to each other and to Mustikkamaa recreational area via bridges. The Helsinki Zoo is located on a 23 hectare rocky island, named Korkeasaari. The competition area further includes two small islands connected to the main island, one of them (Palosaari, 1.2 ha) housing the zoo quarantine building and a rehabilitation centre for injured wild animals. The other island (Hylkysaari, 3.2 ha) at present belongs to the state, serving as a conservation and research area for the National Marine Museum. There is also an old protected office/exhibit building and two protected small villas on Hylkysaari island.

There is a bridge connection across the 240 m wide Mustikkamaasalmi (Mustikkamaa strait), which separates the zoo from public park Mustikkamaa, established in 1920. Year-round traffic is arranged via the bridge connecting the zoo to a recreational area with parking space for zoo visitors on the northern side of Mustikkamaa island. The main gate of the zoo, at the far end of the bridge, is about 800 m from the parking area. There is also a bus stop next to the entrance building.

Korkeasaari is located in the middle of a large seascape of Kruunuvuorenselkä bay. Further 1.2 km east is Laajasalo and Kruunuvuorenranta, currently an oil terminal, which will be developed as residential areas in the next decades. The distance to the old city district, Katajanokka is approximately 450 m and from the future residential area, Sörnäinen-Kalasatama only 240 m.
2.2 Changes in the city structure

The competition area will be greatly influenced by development in the neighbouring areas. With the current industrial harbours moved to Vuosaari in 2008, Helsinki will experience a major change in its urban structure during the next decades. Industry, storage and harbour operations are replaced by residential areas, administration, services and recreation. Through this change in the surrounding cityscape the functional appearance of the design area will change as well.

Close to Korkeasaari, new residential development at the Kalasatama waterfront will expect 18,000 inhabitants and 10,000 job opportunities to the area by 2030. The current master plan for Kalasatama has included the north-east shore of Korkeasaari into the open recreational area with proposed bridges connecting Kalasatama and Mustikkamaa. In the local plan for Sörnäistenranta there is a pedestrian bridge connection to Mustikkamaa. The bridge spanning over the strait will provide a new access route to Kalasatama metro station and other public transport services. Bridge connections in this area will encourage cycling and walking between the city centre and eastern parts of the city.

Kruunuvuorenranta is another future development area neighbouring Korkeasaari towards east across the Kruunuvuoren selkä bay. The area is presently occupied by the Laajasalo oil harbour and it will be free of the harbour operations by 2010. A new seaside housing district for approximately 15,000 inhabitants will be built on the site of the present oil harbour and the adjoining land.

A tramline will link Korkeasaari to Kalasatama and the city centre via bridges in future.
3. Aims of the competition

3.1 Planning Objectives
The aim was to develop Korkeasaari and Hylkysaari into a high quality and functionally diverse park open for zoo visitors. It was hoped that competitors would generate fresh ideas and an overall perspective of combining the functions conservation, education, recreation and history.

The general planning objectives were divided into four categories. Planning principles concern the concept of the zoo, landscape planning, urban structure and interests of the City of Helsinki.

3.2 Zoo Planning Objectives
The zoo’s primary function is participation in the conservation of biodiversity. Helsinki Zoo is especially suited for mountain and northern animals. The image of the zoo as an expert in the conservation and education of these species should be strengthened. The unique rocky island terrain should be used to best advantage in creating natural-like habitats.

Ecological display
Education and training are major tasks of the zoo. The zoo aims as well at promoting environmental awareness in society. The zoo focuses on providing information concerning the human impacts on nature and wildlife, conservation of biodiversity, endangered and threatened species and environmental sustainability. Information available for visitors will be integrated in exhibit design. The visitors will have the live experience with the animal and their natural habitat. The zoo provides formal and informal education opportunities, for example interactive learning assisted by latest technology. There will also be nature school and an auditorium for formal lessons.

Circulation is functional
All age groups are taken into consideration in designing the path system and circulation in the zoo. The main routes need to be accessible for elderly and disabled people, children and baby strollers even in the winter time when there is snow and ice on the ground. There should be only one public entrance area to the zoo.

Because of the future free public access on the northern part of the zoo island, the security issues need to be considered. The quarantine area and hospital for wild animals will continue to operate in connection with the zoo and their position on a separate island is optimal for security reasons.

The zoo is rich in experience
The enclosures should resemble natural habitats and be integrated into entire architectural concept of the zoological garden.

This approach offers an optimal platform to inform visitors about wildlife and explain ecosystem in a comprehensive manner. In a habitat based exhibits the visitor is placed inside the habitat landscape by extending the complexity of the animal’s environment into areas where visitors walk, stand or sit. In a landscape immersion exhibit the encounter with wild animals is more emotional which emphasizes the learning experience.

Accommodation is provided in the zoo area year round to enable longer stay at the site. Overnight and extended day programs are available for visitor groups after opening hours. Indoor exhibit space should be markedly increased.

To provide families and children with enjoyable surroundings there will be more playgrounds and picnic sites.

Developing underground exhibits for nocturnal animals
The zoo is extended by underground exhibits placed in bedrock of the island. Nocturnal species can be shown in underground exhibits where it’s possible to observe active animals in their natural waking hours. In the bedrock there can also be utilities like galleries, auditorium and storage space which would be obtrusive if placed on the ground. The possibility to connect the new underground facilities with existing indoor exhibits should be examined. Continuous indoor space is convenient for visitors especially in winter time.
3.3 Landscape objectives

Maritime character is emphasized
The opportunity of being located in the middle of seascape is a phenomenal starting point for planning. Currently, the ferry trip is the only possibility to enjoy the maritime scenes. Taking full advantage of the maritime nature could be achieved for example by re-opening vistas to the sea, developing the shoreline and making the island accessible by boat. Swimming beaches and other maritime recreation can be situated in Hylkysaari island.

Landscape features are utilized in zoo design
Distinctive landscape features like topography, vegetation and views to surroundings are emphasized to create unique atmosphere. Opportunities to rest and admire the views and other enjoyable surroundings in the park are created on the shoreline and lookout spots. The underground spaces are located in ample bed rock of the island.

Korkeasaari and Hylkysaari are characterised as active recreational area
The shorelines and parks are multi-functional and aesthetical to a high degree. The park is used for recreational purposes and different kind of leisure time activities are encouraged. The old park needs renewing, new plantation and lights etc. The protected buildings in the park can be integrated in the park design.

The national park character and recreational needs require are to be encouraged and strengthened.

Korkeasaari provides the visitors with a pleasant park environment inside the zoo. Functions in Hylkysaari concentrate on recreational use, education and culture events and exhibitions.

Historical layers are preserved
The aim is to preserve the park milieu and buildings with historical value as a part of new design.

3.4 Cityscape, Functional objectives

Korkeasaari island is a part of the waterfront promenade
A new bridge connection to Kalasatama will link Korkeasaari island as a part of continuous waterfront route. The north-east shore region stretching from the main bridge west to the present ferry harbour will be developed for public use and recreational routes. Fencing the public area is necessary and much consideration should be given to designing the feasible and aesthetic solution for the fence between public area and the zoo as well as the path system. A new entrance area to the zoo and a possible tram stop will be located in this area.

Public transport routes are included in the plans
The new public transport route alignment is planned through the northern edge of Korkeasaari island. The other possibility is to reach the tram line to Kalasatama and connect the Korkeasaari island by a pedestrian bridge to Kalasatama. Either way the accessibility of the zoo by public transport improves dramatically.

Improved connection to Mustikkamaa island
The pedestrian route from Mustikkamaa island parking area to the zoo needs revitalisation and attraction along the route. The route is divided into series of functional and landscape features.

Hylkysaari island focus on educational and recreational use
Hylkysaari island is to be developed into a multi-functional centre for education, research and leisure time activities with landscape and historical values. The historical values and preserved buildings are an important content of the plan.

Potential sites for new building
The proposal should present the possible sites and areas for new construction. In the proposal there should be presented the future possibilities for building in case of new requirement for zoo facilities.
3.5 The City of Helsinki: Recreational, educational and financial objectives

Korkeasaari attracts a lot of visitors
Korkeasaari attracts both inhabitants from Helsinki as well as tourists from Finland and abroad. The number of visitors will increase in the future.

Korkeasaari is a unique zoo.
The aim is to renew the zoo and create original solutions. The traditional concept is insufficient to attract and inspire new visitors. A new approach to the concept of a zoo and its maritime surroundings will promote its attractiveness even at an international level.

The zoo strengthens the image of the city
The aim is to develop the zoo as a tourist attraction and a sight worth visiting. In this sense the zoo will reinforce the image of the city.

Place of education and research
Korkeasaari island and Hylkysaari island should be developed as a center for education and research concerning nature and conservation. The aim is to create a strong engagement to environmental and conservation issues.

3.6 Evaluation criteria
In the judging of the competition attention were paid to the functional and cityscape factors of the competition proposals, with particular attention being paid to quality of the following aspects:

A. Landscape merits affected by:
- creation of a suitable visual identity for the zoo and recreational areas
- general landscape approach
- freshness of ideas
- pleasantness and experiential quality from the visitors and animal perspective
- skilful use of vegetation to define space
- general appearance, character and identity of the area
- preserving the characteristics of the built environment and park areas of historical value
- relationship with natural landscape features

B. Functional quality affected by:
- the consideration of the needs of different user groups to create a functional concept
- practical circulation in the zoo
- functional and architectural character of the entrance area
- the accessibility of the main routes
- flexibility and multi-functionality in different seasons and at different times of day
- the exploitation and promotion of the maritime character
4. General evaluation

General evaluation

The competition level was good and the judges saw that the competition produced feasible ideas on how to develop Korkeasaari. The competition produced three very different, interesting, and carefully thought-out plans about ideas. The plans include interesting ideas, solutions, and viewpoints for developing the concept of the zoo and raising the recreational value of the area. The most significant differences between the different proposals were evident in the level of processing needed and in the extent and versatility of the development possibilities offered by the proposals. The proposals represented a very moderate approach maintaining the current outlook as well as a novel approach creating something new and significantly changing the current status.

Based on all the proposals, it would be possible to continue planning on a conceptual level in order to form a more detailed general plan while retaining the basic idea of the plan at hand.

In estimating the competition, the judges paid particular attention to the cityscape and functional solutions of the proposals as well as to the modification of the landscape. The competition was held in a situation where the status of Korkeasaari is continually changing in the city structure. Thanks to the new tram connection, pedestrian bridges and constructing the Kalasatama [Fish harbour] area, Korkeasaari will form a more integral part of the city structure and will be reached more easily. Even though in all the proposals the presentation of the future rail traffic connection had largely been ignored, the possibility to integrate the plans with the future traffic solutions was one central point that was estimated. All of the proposals had paid much attention to the accessibility of the zoo and the experiential routes on the island.

The precision in presenting the respective details varied greatly between all the proposals. In part, solutions had been investigated carefully and adapted skilfully to the existing geography. Some solutions were presented only in main principle, in reference and as lists. The main idea and concept were presented very clearly in all the proposals, and the physical surroundings produced by the plans were understandable from the schematic images and written explanations. The level of presentations in the proposals is impressive on the whole. In one proposal, the plan had been illustrated even with extra miniature models.

The objective of the competition was to find an innovative and fresh way to develop the historical national park and zoo. A more clear and attractive identity is sought for Korkeasaari, which was a part of the objective for the competition.

The approach to the city's structure was somewhat weak in all of the competitive proposals. Connecting Korkeasaari to its surroundings had been presented referentially or even against the principles that were presented in the competition's agenda and no proposal presented wider ideas about the city's structure that would have been believable. For example, the development of Hylkysaari [Shipwreck Island] has remained on a very general and careful level in the proposals. Mainly concentrating the work on Korkeasaari is understandable due to the landscape-architectural nature of the competition. In addition, the targets of the competition agenda were so extensive that taking all of them into consideration in one proposal seems to have been too challenging.

Beluga presents a radical solution where only rather little of the old structures is maintained. However, if realized, it clearly changes the zoo and brings a new outlook to it. The juxtaposition in the entrance between the artificial area and the nature status of the rest of the area is a surprising, yet inspiring solution. Implementing the work requires big efforts and investments. If implemented well, Beluga could raise the Korkeasaari zoo to a new level and give the city a new, individual tourist attraction.

Kozoo offers a commercial brand that has partly been developed very highly. However, using the competition work in question as the basis of the master plan is very challenging. There is an immense amount of single, individual ideas, some of which are unrealistic. The work emphasises the national park side at the cost of the zoo.

Islands and islands is a work following the assignment that was given very strictly, but also a little colourless and modest in its ideas. Preserving the old historical structures has been considered, which will most likely be one of the factors guiding the construction in the future. The changes presented in the work are for the most part fully implementable.

Kaikkien ehdotusten pohjalta olisi mahdollista jatkaa suunnittelua ideaata alueen yksityiskohtaisempaan yleisusuunnitelmaan suunnitelmien perusidea säilyttämiseen ja


Kilpailun tavoitteena oli löytää innovatiivinen ja raikas tapa kehittää historiallisista kansanpuistosta ja eläintarhaa. Korkea- saarelle toivotaan selkeämpää ja vetovoimaisempaa identiteettiä, jonka määrittele myös kilpailulla pyritään.

Kilpailuehdotuksien kaupunkirkakenteellinen ote kaikkinaan oli hiukan heikko. Korkeasaaren liittyminen ympäristöönsä oli esitetty osittain ja jopa vastoin kilpailuohjelman esitetyitä periaatteita, eikä yksikään ehdotus esittänyt sellaisia laajempia kaupunkirakenteellisia ideoita, jotka olisivat olleet uskottavia.

## 5. Estimation of individual proposals

### 5.1 Proposal “Beluga”

The proposal is very impressive from the architectonic and landscaping viewpoint, which is consistent in its design philosophy and it is rather interesting.

The rocky island is developed from its natural starting points. The geographical areas for animals have sought their place based on the landscape. The woody and open areas are located naturally in the terrain, as clear entities. Korkeasaari is divided clearly into the constructed part for the visitors and the nature part for the animals. Only the protected structures and large trees have been preserved from the current surroundings; otherwise, Korkeasaari has undergone an evolutionary change. The current buildings have been demolished, except for the protected buildings. This emphasises the position of the new suggested buildings in the landscape. The botanical area and its picturesque realisation form a natural part of the national park. The most luxuriant parts of the islands have been presented as park-like areas where the protected buildings, mainly from the national park era, are located. Thus, the historical areas form a successful whole that includes not only the buildings, but also the park-like near surroundings. Moreover, the green but rocky nature of Hylkysaari [Shipwreck Island] fits well into the insular landscape.

The public park space has been minimised by locating a large terrain-adapted building on the north side of the island. This building acts as the entrance to the zoo. The entrance building includes two tropical halls, a hall exhibiting nighttime animals, as well as services and a ticket sale point. From the Kalasatama [Fish Harbour] shore, the entrance is through a ropeway. Placing the new identifying buildings at the points suggested is justified from the landscape point of view. The entrance building forms a landmark that can be seen from the city proper and from the direction of the future Kruunuvuori [Crown Mountain] area. Building the arctic area in the fill-area next to Palosaari [Burn Island] makes it possible to landscape the tram line terraces as a part of the island. However, the new buildings remain behind the highest parts of the island when viewed from the sea, which means that the total outline of the island remains as it was, which is a part of the rugged insular landscape of Helsinki. The total outlook and silhouette of the island remains park-like and rocky.

The routes are interesting and the versatility of the terrain has been utilised in the linings and levelling. The summer and winter routes present visitors with all the different sides of the zoo. Directing the winter routes to the indoor areas of the zoo opens a new viewpoint to the life of animals and their care.

The proposal has ignored some of the starting points for the planning that was given in the work agenda, such as strengthening national park history and the recreational use related to this as along with the traffic plans and connection to the current city structure. The proposal does not present a tram connection on the north side of the island, but can be seen as enabling by placing the tram line on the Korkeasaari north shore. Developing the area between Palosaari [Burn Island] and Korkeasaari as an area for arctic species and the entrance building conforming to the form of the landscape both support the tram line. Constructing on the shores changes the look of the island when viewed from close range. The concrete-rimmed cleaning sinks for drainage water form a fairly heavily treated shoreline. The sturdiness of the structures and the great amount of sinks are unnecessary considering the principles of handling drainage water. The structures form a foreign border in the islands landscape. The proposal has not suggested the utilisation of the rock resources, except for partly embedding the entrance building into the terrain.

The proposal has been presented in a very logical manner. The problems with the current status of the area have been solved by changing the nature and outlook of the entire area, although the proposal has investigated the implementation of the change in phases. A strong total approach is the proposal’s strength and its weakness; the architectonic and landscape-related impressiveness is based nearly too much on renewing, concentrating construction, and on the architectonic look of the new buildings.

The protection of species has been taken into consideration in the presented species selections: polar bears represent taking climate change into consideration and a serious look into the future. Utilising the aquatic environment has been outlined innovatively in other ways as well. However, the species selections also present difficult species to take care of. The measurements of animal spaces are sometimes too small and it is not likely that household animals would be held in the presented scale. The animal spaces have been planned to reach the shore, which from a landscape perspective gives a sense of openness in the animal spaces (so-called borrowed landscapes), but this is demanding from the point of view of environmental stress. The work presents themes that fit the current animal species. The large indoor spaces enable presenting the exotic biodiversity themes mentioned in the assignment in the northern conditions.

The visitor’s experience is supported by routes on which the visitor approaches the animal spaces little by little, in which not everything can be seen at once. The terrace-like structure on the east side of the island is an interesting and probably functional solution in presenting animals from different altitude zones. There is something to see immediately next to the entrance, which is a clear deficiency in the current setup of Korkeasaari visitors’ route.
The work supports the educational and instructional task of Korkeasaari e.g. with teaching facilities and an outdoor theatre. Cane-grass cleansing has also been considered as a theme related to environmental protection, although it is oversized in the extent presented in the proposal. On the other hand, reducing energy consumption or using renewing energy sources have not been included as factors guiding the planning.

The work does not particularly protect the historical values, e.g. the old ferry harbour disappears entirely, together with many other old buildings. However, the planning of recreational and visitor routes is innovative: separate summer and winter routes as well as the picnic and play areas located on different sides are some of these new elements.

The year-round visitor may be troubled with teaching facilities and an outdoor theatre. Cane-grass cleansing has also been considered as a theme related to environmental protection, although it is oversized in the extent presented in the proposal. On the other hand, reducing energy consumption or using renewing energy sources have not been included as factors guiding the planning.

Ehdotus on arkkiitehtonisesti ja maise-malliselta kokonaisotteeltaan erittäin vai-kuttava sekä suunnittelufilosofiaaltaan johdonmukainen ja kiinnostava.


5.1 Ehdotus “Beluga”

The plan creates a new attractive zoo and a culture and science centre in Helsinki. The proposal has created a strong sustainable idea that provides good possibilities to renew the current zoo.
kä ehdotuksen vahvuuks että sen heikko-
us; arkkitehtoaminen ja maisemallinen vai-
kuttavuus perustuu liiankin paljon uusi-
miseen, rakentamisen keskittämiseen ja uu-
disarakennusten arkkitehtoamiseen il-
meeseen.

Lajien suojelutyö on huomioitu esite-
tyissä lajivalinoissa: jääkarhu ilmentää il-
ammonmuutoksen huomioimista ja tu-
levaisuuteen katsomista. Vesipyöräis-
tön hyödyntäminen on muutoinkin inno-
vativisesti haluteltu. Toisaalta lajivalin-
noissa on myös hoidon kannalta vaikei-
ta lajeja. Eläintilojen mitoitukset ovat pai-
koin liian pienet, ja kotieläinten pito esite-
yssä mittakaavassa ei ole todennäkois-
tä. Eläintilojen on suunniteltu ulottuvan 
raantaan saakka, mikä maisemallisesti an-
taa avaruuden tunnetta eläintiloihin (ns 
borrowed landscapes), mutta on vaativa 
ypäräistökuormitusten hallinnan kannal-
ta. Työssä on esitelty teemoja, jotka sopi-
vat nykyiseen eläinlajistoon. Isot sisätilat 
mahdollistavat tehtävänannossa esitetty-
jen eksoottisten biodiversiteetiteemojen 
esitelyn pohjoisissa oloissa.

Kävijänäyttöä tuetaan reitein, joissa 
kävijä lähestyy eläintiloja vähittäin, eikä 
kaikki ole kerralla nähtävissä. Terassimai-
suus saaren itäpuolella on mielenkiintoi-
nen ja luultavasti toimiva ratkaisu eri kor-
keusvyöhykkeiden eläinten esittelystä.

Eläintilojen tuntuma on heti katsot-
tavaa, mikä nykyisellä on selvä puute 
Korkeasaaren kävijäreille.

Työ tukee Korkeasaaren opetus- ja va-
listustehtäviä mm. opetustilojen ja ul-
koilmatieteen avulla. Ruovikkopuh-
distus ympäristönuojelullisena teema-
na on myös huomioitu, joskin ehdotuk-
see esittämässä laajuudessa ylimitoitet-
tu. Toisaalta energiankulutuksen vähent-
ämistä tai uusiutuvia energianlähteitä ei 
ole otettu mukaan suunnittelua ohjaavi-
na tekijöinä.

Työ ei erityisesti suojele historiallisia 
arvoja, esim. vanha lauttasatama katoaa 
kokonaan, samoin moni muu vanha ra-
kennus. Sen sijaan virkistys ja kävijäreit-
tien suunnittelu on innovatiivista: erilliset 
kesä- ja talvireitit sekä eri puolilla sijaitsee-
vat picnic- ja leikkipaikat ovat näitä uusia 
elementtejä.

Ympäriuotista kävijää voi arveluttaa 
ehdotettu kaikkien lämpimien sisätilojen 
sijoittuminen sisäänkäynnin tuntumaan. 
Eläintilojen käyttö lämpimänä tukipisteinä 
talvisaikaan on mahdollista, ja se on otet-
tava huomioon tulevaisuuden rakennus-
ten suunnittelussa. Suunnitelman toteu-
tus kaiken kaikkiaan on selkeästi yli vuos-
sikymmenen hanke.

Suunnittelussa luodaan uusi vetovoi-
mainen eläintarha sekä kulttuurin ja tie-
teen keskus Helsinkiin. Ehdotus on lu-
nut kantavan vahvan idean, joka antaa 
hyvät mahdollisuudet nykyisen eläin-
tarhan uudistamiselle sen puitteissa.
The proposal is quite traditional and careful, but follows the issues that are required in the work agenda very strictly, except for the public transport arrangements. The visitor viewpoint is emphasised instead of the architectonic viewpoint. The visitor route in the zoo has been planned very logically. The public is led around the zoo on a specific route that is carefully phased in the plan.

The proposal respects the current complete outline of the island and discreetly takes into consideration the varying terrain. However, the total division is fairly ordinary; the animal spaces have been added with “hotspots”, play areas, and public service areas. Except for the formation of the steppe area, the landscape has been kept nearly as-is. One of the largest renewal actions in the proposal is a new tropical house and connected series of tunnel spaces showcasing the life of nocturnal animals. The new Amazonia house with subterranean spaces has been placed in connection to the current spaces. Its glass roof remains barely below the intact treetop line, so the island outlook remains as it was when viewed from a distance. The entrance to the tunnel network has been placed in the old Karhulinna [Bear Castle] that binds the macabre remains of the old structures into the new complex.

The proposal is based on one main route only. The route is carefully lined in the terrain, partly excavated in the basic level or placed up on panorama bridges. The route offers the visitor interesting view angles and is unhindered throughout. The service route has been separated from the main route skilfully by placing it into a different level or into a tunnel in the critical points. The proposal has turned entering the zoo into a full-scale event by also placing gate structures to Mustikkamaa and the Kalasatama [Fish Harbour] metro station. Modifying the current bridge to a more visitor-friendly version is justified.

The proposal concentrates on solving the problems in the current status, one at a time while maintaining the nature and identity of Korkeasaari similar to what it was. In the plan, the zoo is well organised. Korkeasaari offers possibilities to spend free time, and the old national park tradition has been enlivened. The thin park zone in the shores keeps the general outlook of the island nearly in the current status. The biological cleaning sink of surface water has been placed in the strait next to Hylkysaari [Shipwreck Island] and is included as a part of the environmental programme for the zoo. The placement is good when considering collecting the waters from the south-side of the island.

The east-west park valley with its ponds and streams emphasises the value of the landscape in the national park era. The ideas for the current ferry shore as adventure play site and swimming beach completes the recreational use of the park surroundings in a modern way.

The current buildings have mainly been preserved and the new buildings indicated in the plan bring their own layer in the varying building base of Korkeasaari.

The proposal has not taken into consideration the tram line on the north side of the island. On the contrary, the Korkeasaari nature as a separate island has been particularly emphasised. The entryways to the island remain; a ferry and the Mustikkamaa bridge. The ferry pier has been moved next to the bridge.

The new entrance building has been placed in an excellent location from a landscape viewpoint, but the related open spaces seem to be confined in size. A modest building is subjected to a strong topography. A steep slope has defined the area of the open space. Modifying the terrain more strongly would have provided more space for the central gathering and orientation place. A new treatment of the north shore and the entrance area enable the laying out of the track next to the entrance area, but it has not been presented in the plan pictures. Instead, Mustikkamaa shows a new pedestrian bridge, which is against the Kalasatama [Fish harbour] area partial master plan.

The planning and locating of animal spaces has followed the guidelines that were given in the assignment fairly strictly. The work presents the use of subterranean space as animal showcase space, but it does not refine the theme. The cane-grass area has been planned for drainage water and the wetland animals. The enlargement of the tropic and subterranean showcase rooms to be built in connection with them seems realistic and implementable. However, placing the baboons on the roof of the building is somewhat surprising.

Re-using the old spaces as animal spaces is an interesting idea. These new ideas include e.g. using the small stone castle for the entrance of the subterranean and tropical space as well as using Karhulinna [Bear castle] for sea mammals. In addition, utilising the baboon castle for presenting birds is worth considering.

The work has paid attention to using Kalasatama [Fish Harbour] and Mustikkamaa in distributing information. The hotspots or the areas of the world containing the most species are a good starting point for a presentation of the species. The nature school and the Baltic Sea information centre has been placed in Hylkysaari [Shipwreck Island], but neither of them have been given any more thought.

The work offers a clear public route that has secondary routes as side tracks. Using the bridge and shore areas has been thought of from the recreational point of view. In addition, aquatic topics have been used skilfully. The themed playgrounds, picnic areas, and restaurants have been placed on different sides of the island and can be serviced through a tunnel network as well as aboveground routes.
5.2 Ehdotus "Islands and Islands"

The subterranean space and new tropical house add immersion displays that the zoo needs. Including the historical buildings and combining them into displays is clearly one of the most positive suggestions in the work. The current animal species have been utilised and the presented indoor spaces enable presenting the ecosystems given in the assignment.

As a whole, the proposal is functional and it includes many inventive solutions, but the environment it creates does not necessarily offer an unforgettable adventure or is not internationally exceptional and unique. The solutions are realistic, but very(excessively??) careful.


Ehdotus perustuu vain yhteen pääreit- tiin, joka on linjattu moitteettomasti maas- ton paikoil perustasoon kaivautuen tai ylös näkonalaisilleilta sijoitettuna. Reitti tarjoilee kävijille monien erilaisia tiedoja, jolloin saaren ilme kaukonamissuoraan jäävää entisellään. Sisäänkäynti tunnelitiloistoon on sijoitettu vanhaan Karhulinnan, joka sijaitsee vanhan rakennusmaksan mahaabeen ja ajanneen osaksi uutta kokonaisuutta.

Ehdotus perustuu vain yhteen pääreit- tiin, joka on linjattu moitteettomasti maas- ton paikoil perustasoon kaivautuen tai ylös näkonalaisilleilta sijoitettuna. Reitti tarjoilee kävijille monien erilaisia tiedoja, jolloin saaren ilme kaukonamissuoraan jäävää entisellään. Sisäänkäynti tunnelitiloistoon on sijoitettu vanhaan Karhulinnan, joka sijaitsee vanhan rakennusmaksan mahaabeen ja ajanneen osaksi uutta kokonaisuutta.

Ehdotus perustuu vain yhteen pääreit- tiin, joka on linjattu moitteettomasti maas- ton paikoil perustasoon kaivautuen tai ylös näkonalaisilleilta sijoitettuna. Reitti tarjoilee kävijille monien erilaisia tiedoja, jolloin saaren ilme kaukonamissuoraan jäävää entisellään. Sisäänkäynti tunnelitiloistoon on sijoitettu vanhaan Karhulinnan, joka sijaitsee vanhan rakennusmaksan mahaabeen ja ajanneen osaksi uutta kokonaisuutta.

Ehdotus perustuu vain yhteen pääreit- tiin, joka on linjattu moitteettomasti maas- ton paikoil perustasoon kaivautuen tai ylös näkonalaisilleilta sijoitettuna. Reitti tarjoilee kävijille monien erilaisia tiedoja, jolloin saaren ilme kaukonamissuoraan jäävää entisellään. Sisäänkäynti tunnelitiloistoon on sijoitettu vanhaan Karhulinnan, joka sijaitsee vanhan rakennusmaksan mahaabeen ja ajanneen osaksi uutta kokonaisuutta.

Ehdotus perustuu vain yhteen pääreit- tiin, joka on linjattu moitteettomasti maas- ton paikoil perustasoon kaivautuen tai ylös näkonalaisilleilta sijoitettuna. Reitti tarjoilee kävijille monien erilaisia tiedoja, jolloin saaren ilme kaukonamissuoraan jäävää entisellään. Sisäänkäynti tunnelitiloistoon on sijoitettu vanhaan Karhulinnan, joka sijaitsee vanhan rakennusmaksan mahaabeen ja ajanneen osaksi uutta kokonaisuutta.
Vanhojen tilojen uusikäyttö eläintiloissa on mielenkiintoinen ajatus. Näitä uusia ideoita on mm. pienen kivilinnan käytäminen maanalaisen ja tropiikkitilan sisäantuloon, sekä Karhulinnan käyttö merinisäkkäille. Samoin paviaanilinnan yödyntäminen lintujen esittelyyn on harkitseminen arvoista.

Työssä on kiinnitetty huomiota Kala-sataman ja Mustikkamaan käyttöön informaation jaossa. Hotspotit eli maailman lajirikkaat alueet lajiston esittelyn pohjana on hyvä lähtökohta. Luontokoulu ja Itämeri-infokeskus on sijoitettu Hyllykysäareen, mutta kappaakaan ei ole ideoituhidemmälle.

Työ tarjoaa selkeää yleisöreitin, josta sekundaariset polut lähtelevät sivujuonteina. Sillan käyttöä sekä ranta-alueita on mietitty virkistysnäkökulmasta, samoin vesialoja on käytetty taitavasti. Teemaliset leikkipuistot, picnic-alueet ja ravintolat on sijoitettu eri puolille saarta, jota voidaan huoltaa sekä tunneliverkostoon, että maan pinnalla kulkevien reittien kautta.


Ehdotus on kokonaisuutena toimiva ja se sisältää monia kekseliäitä ratkaisuja, mutta sen luoma ympäristö ei välttämättä tarjoa unohtumatonta seikkailua tai ole kansainvälisesti poikkeuksellinen ja unikki. Ratkaisut ovat realistisia, mutta hyvin varovaisia.
The proposal approaches the planning assignment intellectually, playfully, and innovatively in handing the entire zoo concept. The spontaneity, curiosity, joy of learning, and versatility best describe the surroundings created by the proposal.

In the proposal, Korkeasaari zoo has been turned into an internationally known brand. The significance of the zoo in protecting the endangered species on earth and their habitats and biomass, in relaying information and teaching has been presented strongly. The information is relayed to the user through the web, books, brochures, and experiencing the physical environment itself. The starting point for the proposal is not so much the physical surroundings but more so the whole concept that has been used in the task. A macro cosmos as the one presented could be implemented in other kinds of environments. The value of the work lies specifically in its conceptual nature. Developing the zoo has been presented as a process that at the same time describes the constant change status of nature.

The zoo offers everyone an individual way to familiarise with the area. The zoo is entered in different ways and from different directions; different kinds of services, routes, learning and observation promoting things are available. The route network is formed of a gently winding main route that is very easily reached from any point. The learning tracks and off-track adventure paths separate from main route in the form of a star chart, leading to five observation towers. The calm promenade circling the island is completed with various routes that criss-cross around and offer an innovative route network supporting differentiating learning and instruction. For the most part, the passageways modelling constellations have been lifted from the ground as bridges. They form a network over the island that can be seen from between the trees also when viewed from a distance. Getting the lifted routes unhindered requires building long ramps.

Lining the off-track routes in the rugged rocky terrain is challenging in order to protect the sensitive vegetation from wearing.

The work illustrates a modern approach to instruction, based on interaction and the use of modern technology. An innovative visitor route has been presented where differentiated learning is possible for groups on a different level. The weak part of the proposal is that in a large part it remains only as a conceptual proposal and implementing the plan under the terms of the Korkeasaari landscape has been discussed only very lightly. As a thought, the possibilities offered by the island topography have been utilised, even though they have not been presented in detail or planned detailed enough. People move through the zoo not only aboveground on different routes but also under it in an extensive tunnel network excavated in the bedrock, as well as above the surface on bridges and in observation towers. Numerous different, exciting encounters are thus formed between the public and the animals.

The plan has defined locations for the new buildings, but has not presented their architecture in detail. The new buildings and structures bring their own layer into the versatile building base of Korkeasaari. Old buildings have been saved, so the general outlook of the island is kept rather layered and partly confusing as well. Except for creating the subterranean world, many of the suggested actions are fairly light, such as building observation towers and pedestrian bridges. The new buildings and structures have been located seemingly haphazardly around the island, but they have sought important scenery locations and high points in the terrain. Planting the new trees in the amount suggested clouds the spatial variation of the landscape. The rhythm between the open and woody sections disappears and a part of the significant sceneries is hidden. The species presented will not thrive in Finland under all parts.

The treatment of drainage water has been made an integral part of the plan and building the needed infrastructure has been suggested to service the entire island – not just for show.

There are altogether four entrances instead of just one suggested in the competition agenda. For both cost management and security, this is a major risk and the proposal does not satisfactorily cover the means by which the public and paid part of the zoo will be separated. The zoo is entered, in addition to the Mustikkamaa bridge, with small boats from the east, with a ferry from the west and through the Hylkkäsaari [Shipwreck Island] pier on a cruise ship. Due to the large amount of entrances, the plan was not able to present a solution for separating the public and paid park in a safe manner with sufficient supervision. The public space is emphasised much more than in the other works. This kind of separation between public and animal spaces with the presented species and the available surface area is not possible. The planning of shore routes has been paid attention commendably much.

Securing biomass theme remains thin and a little distant. Biodiversity must be a more important aim than securing biomass. The connection between adding an abundance of vegetation and opening the scenery and the spatial impression of the island remains open. The aquatic theme is the only one presented in more detail.

The subterranean space has been utilised both as a teaching facility and as a logistical route. Furthermore, a part of the staff member facilities is located underground. Utilising subterranean space may be the only possibility to widen the operation and increase the space available for use by the public. This also enables implementing the layers of time and cherishing the existing historical building base.
Ehdotus lähestyy suunnittelutehtävää älyllisesti, leikkisesti ja hyvin innovatiivisesti koko eläintarha-konseptin käsittelyssä. Spontaanius, uteliasuus, oppimisen riemu ja monipuolisuus kuvaavat parhaiten ehdotuksen luomua ympäris- töä.


On esitetty innovatiivinen kävijäreitti, jol- la kulkuesi entasosille ryhmille erityset ehdotuksen heikous on siinä, että se jää suurella määrin pelkkään konseptualiseksi ja suunnittelun toteuttaminen Korkeasaar- nen saa esitetyn käytävät on käsitetty hyvin kevyesti. Ajatuksena saaren topografian ja tasavertailun mahdollisuudet on hyödynnet- ty, vaikka niitä ei ole tarkasti esitetty tai viety suunnittelussa riittävälle tarkkuuu- delle. Eläintarhassa liikutaan paitsi maan pinnalla erilaisilla reiteillä, myös sen alla ja maan alle. Peruskallion louhitun tunne- leverkostossa ja pinnan yläpuolella sililloilla ja näkötorneilla. Yleisön ja eläinten välil- le muodostuu näin lukematon määrä eri- laisia jännittäviä kohtaamisia.


Hulevesien käsittely on otettu olennai- seksi osaksi suunnitelmasta ja sen tarvit- seman infrastruktuurin rakentaminen on esitetty rakennettavaksi koko saarta pal- velevaksi - ei vain näytösluonteisesti.


KOZOO - the new Korkeasaari Zoo - is a microcosm inscribed in a circle. Everything taking place within this circle focuses on the protection of not only animals, but biomass in a broader sense. Everything extinctable.

The world's biomass is deteriorating. We should fight the development, ever more. In order to do so, we are not only to preserve habitats which maintain the welfare of the species and secure the life of actual species. Protecting wildlife today is more than an act of preservation. It starts with creating awareness among people of the importance of a complex, biologically rich world. KOZOO symbolizes the value of the circle of life in which the animal kingdom is an integral part of the ecosystem of animals, plants, and the earth itself. The earth and all its living species are elements of the circle.

KOZOO is a reality creating. Organizing physical reality within a spatial context and then waiting to see what happens - this allows for unforeseen coincidences - is the starting point of the new rethinking of the zoo. KOZOO's core is the exhibition and experience of the animal kingdom. The design of the animal kingdom is a reflection of the underlying elements and their interactions. This in turn influences the animal kingdom, and it is in this way that it acquires the balance of nature. The design of the animal kingdom is the result of the natural balance of the earth, the earth's climate, and the interactions of animals, plants, and the earth itself.

KOZOO is a virtual landscape which involves the architecture design of the Korkeasaari Zoo experience, but is not only limited to the physical. It starts arising at home in front of your computer when planning your next trip and might even continue when you meet up with friends and relatives after a day of intense experience among the finnish zoo (Gr). Our mission is to support individual zookeepers by creating different knowledge levels including information, education, and research within an open and transparent framework. To this end, KOZOO considers the habitat, landscapes and interaction along with a strong network of communication from the KOZOO programme and the role in securing small amounts of biomass in all areas.

Walk the zoopanorama
KOZOO is organized into different zoopanoramas – inspired by the earth’s different ecological climate areas. Each of these areas is an area with different plants and animals and characterized by specific environmental conditions. Each area is designed to allow visitors to experience the different ecological climate areas of the earth and their inhabitants. The zoopanorama is run by a team of specialists. Walking through the zoopanorama, visitors experience different ecosystems, which move visitors ever closer to understanding the earth and its inhabitants. The zoopanorama is designed to provide visitors with a sense of understanding the earth and its inhabitants.

Learn more
KOZOO is an educational and research-oriented zoo, where learning is possible at all levels. Research has shown that in order to communicate and actively inform people today, it is necessary to challenge the way we think about our curriculum and the way we present our message. This is why the zoopanorama is run by a team of specialists. KOZOO is an educational and research-oriented zoo, where learning is possible at all levels. Research has shown that in order to communicate and actively inform people today, it is necessary to challenge the way we think about our curriculum and the way we present our message. KOZOO is an educational and research-oriented zoo, where learning is possible at all levels.
View towards Pukki

Urbani uplifting

The Kozoo programme optimises the connection between the islands of the Karlssörn Zoo and the rest of Finland, hence the sea and the city. By offering new urban recreational amenities (K203) supports the urban operating, and green areas which already takes place around the Helsinki harbour. The area is accessible from all corners of the world via boat, public bus, bike, bicycle or train. The other situated at the northern edge of the sound in order not to cut the sea in two pieces. Port or the K203 zone is always make the promoting accessible from the waterfront, implying the water is a genuine asset including a bath theme and connected with real-time activities.

30% of the area will serve public recreational functions, determined by a main central area, which maximises the amount of tricking. A new public beach also accessible to boat from the south connects with possi- tities such as the hotel, restaurant and other facilities optimising the public desire and having on a mean for a commercial growth, which will furtherly support the K203 research and information programmes.

Global impact

K203’s initiative on investment on a local or even national scale. Acquiring the suggested means in massive upgrading of the Karlssörn Zoo will create a global exposure of the area and contribute to the global awareness of Finnmark protection and communication. K203 thus becomes a corner- stone of research and knowledge of business and sustainable based on the rich collections. An investment in future international power centres in the heart of Helsinki, but not least an investment in sustaining the noble world we live in.

Read more about K203 at www.kozoo.info
Kozoo

Conceptual levels

New Kozoo Zoo

A pioneering vision of biodiversity, Kozoo is a model for the future of zoos and wildlife conservation. It is designed to provide a home for over 2,000 species of animals from around the world.

Biosphere

A network of interconnected ecosystems, Kozoo aims to replicate the natural habitats of the animals it houses. Each ecosystem is designed to support a specific group of animals, allowing them to thrive in a controlled environment.

Northern Hemisphere

Kozoo is located in the Northern Hemisphere, which is home to many of the world's most iconic and endangered species. The zoo is committed to the conservation of these species and works closely with international organizations to ensure their survival.

Activities all around the clock

Kozoo is open 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, allowing visitors to experience the zoo at any time of the day or night.

Physical levels

36 zones

Each zone is designed to host a specific group of animals, with each group living in an environment that closely resembles their natural habitat.

30 conditions

Each zone is designed to meet the specific needs of the animals it houses, including temperature, humidity, and lighting conditions.

Diagrams

Access

Kozoo is accessible to visitors from all over the world. The zoo is located in the center of the city, making it easily accessible by public transport.

Buildings

The buildings at Kozoo are designed to be energy-efficient and environmentally friendly. They are constructed using sustainable materials and are designed to minimize their impact on the surrounding environment.

Underground exhibits

Kozoo has a network of underground exhibits, which are designed to provide visitors with a unique and immersive experience. The exhibits are designed to simulate the natural environments of the animals they house.

Infrastructure

Kozoo has a state-of-the-art infrastructure, which includes a state-of-the-art veterinary clinic, educational facilities, and research laboratories.

Walk the Zoobiome

Kozoo is designed to be a living, breathing ecosystem, with each zone connected to the others through a network of pathways and trails. Visitors can explore the zoo on foot, on bike, or by electric cart.

Water-ecology

Kozoo is designed to be a model for sustainable water management. The zoo has a network of ponds and lakes, which are used to provide water for the animals and for educational purposes.

Public optimization

Kozoo is committed to being a model for sustainable tourism. The zoo is designed to be energy-efficient and environmentally friendly, and it is committed to minimizing its impact on the surrounding environment.

Kohibak

This area is designed for visitors who want to experience the zoo in a more intimate setting. The area is designed to provide visitors with a more personal experience, with smaller groups of animals and more opportunities for interaction.

Biodiversity

Kozoo is designed to house a diverse range of species, from small mammals to large predators. The zoo is committed to the conservation of biodiversity and works closely with international organizations to ensure the survival of endangered species.

Walk the Zoobiome

Kozoo is designed to be a living, breathing ecosystem, with each zone connected to the others through a network of pathways and trails. Visitors can explore the zoo on foot, on bike, or by electric cart.

Endless landscape

Kozoo is designed to be a model for sustainable tourism. The zoo is designed to be energy-efficient and environmentally friendly, and it is committed to minimizing its impact on the surrounding environment.

Promenade

Kozoo has a network of promenades, which are designed to provide visitors with an immersive experience. The promenades are designed to simulate the natural environments of the animals they house.

Conclusion

Kozoo is a pioneering vision of the future of zoos and wildlife conservation. It is designed to provide a home for over 2,000 species of animals from around the world, and it is committed to the conservation of biodiversity. The zoo is open 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, allowing visitors to experience the zoo at any time of the day or night.
**Section 1:200**

The figure consists of a trench, of which one side is vertical and the other side is stepped and contoured with grades. The excavating is made with a split pipe, and the trench is poured off with gravel and gravel material to improve the area.

**Section 1:200**

The diagram shows the layout of the area with various elements such as trees, buildings, and pathways. The diagram includes sections of different views and perspectives, focusing on the spatial arrangement and design considerations.

**Principal sections**

- **Section 1:** Shows an overhead view of the area with marked pathways and trees. A note suggests that the area is designed for outdoor activities, promoting connectivity and interaction with the natural environment.
- **Section 2:** Demonstrates a close-up view of a specific section, highlighting the detailed design elements and textures.
- **Section 3:** Features a side view, emphasizing the vertical and horizontal alignments and the integration of natural and constructed elements.
- **Section 4:** Provides a detailed section view, focusing on the layers and layers of the design, showcasing the depth and complexity of the project.

A note at the bottom left suggests that the boundary is defined with water, and the boundary line is marked with a specific symbol or marker to denote the division between the two areas.
6. Competition decision and recommendation for further action

6. Kilpailun ratkaisu ja suositus jatkotoimenpiteiksi

Decision of the competition
After comparing the proposals, the judges found that the proposal Beluga best fulfils the objectives of the competition agenda and unanimously decided to place it in first position. The other proposals were not placed in any order of superiority.

Recommendation for further actions
The judges suggest selecting the proposal Beluga as the basis for the continued planning of Korkeasaari and its surroundings.

Korkeasaari will draft a new master plan for the entire area based on the ideas presented in the proposal Beluga, the parts of which will be worked on further with the proposal author(s).

The continued planning will take into consideration the critique and development needs presented by the judges in the estimation minutes.
7. The competition jury

Affirmation of the jury report
Helsinki 18 December 2008

Tuula Haatainen
Deputy Mayor, Chair

Ria Ruokonen
Landscape architect, MARK

Tuomas Rajajärvi
Architect, Director of the City Planning Department

Sakari Mentu
Architect
The National Board of Antiquities

Seppo Turunen
Director of the Helsinki Zoo

Kirsti Pynnönen
Helsinki Zoo, Secretary

Tuomas Hakala
Architect, City Planning Department, Secretary
The envelopes containing the names behind the proposals are found to be unopened, and the creators of the proposals are:

**The winner of the competition “Beluga”**

Architects:  
BECKMANN-N’THEPE & Associés  
Aldric Beckmann  
Françoise N’Thépé  
Wilfried Daufy  
Anne Catherine Dufros  
Constance Héau  
Jessica Pallatier

Landscape Design:  
TN Plus  
Bruno Tanant  
Jean Christophe Nani  
Guillaume Derrien  
Andras Jambor  
Agathe Turmel

Zoo Expert:  
Jean Marc Lernould

**Proposal “Island and Island”**  
Maisemasuunnittelu Hemgård  
Gretel Hemgård, Landscape architect  
MARK  
Hiroko Kivirinta, Landscape architect  
MARK  
Malin Blomqvist, Landscape architect  
MARK  
MA-SU Planning  
Tiina Taipale, student of architecture  
Leena Antikainen, student of landscape architecture

Zoo Experts:  
Dirk Petzold, Biologist m. Sc., Zoo Consult Bielefelt, Germany  
Jukka Alanko

**Proposal “KÖZOO”**  
SLA Architects a/s  
Stig L. Andersson  
Flemming Rafa Thomsen  
Helene Koch  
Salka Kudsk  
Martin Seberg  
Stine Christiansen  
Ida Marie Wedfall  
Nikolai Vittrup  
Daniel Carlsen  
Lene Dammand Lund

Architect:  
Asmo Jaaksi, Architect Safa, JKMM Architects
Tiivistelmä


Kilpailun voittanut ehdotus esitti kokonaisvaltaisen konseptin Korkeasaaren uudelleenjärjestämiseksi. Ehdotus on selkeyttänyt saaren rakennuksia ja uusinut suuren osan nykyistä rakennuskantaa. Suunnitelma on toteutettavissa vaiheittain.
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